

GROTON CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Minutes

July 26, 2011

Chairman Nadia Madden called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the 2nd floor conference room in Town Hall. Members Craig Auman, Bruce Easom, Marshall Giguere, Peter Morrison, Bill Neacy, and David Pitkin were present. Conservation Administrator Barbara Ganem was also present.

In discussion on the July 12th minutes, P. Morrison and C. Auman suggested several changes, and upon a motion by D. Pitkin, seconded by C. Auman, it was

VOTED: to approve the minutes of July 12, 2011 as amended.

Upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by B. Easom, it was

VOTED: to approve and issue the amended Order of Conditions for 49 Old Ayer Rd., DEP#169-1060 under the Wetlands Protection Act.

Upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by B. Neacy, it was

VOTED: to approve and issue the amended Order of Conditions for 49 Old Ayer Rd. DEP#169-1060 under the Wetlands Protection Bylaw.

7:15 p.m. – 25 Ridgewood Avenue Request for Determination of Applicability

Owner Margaret Langley explained she was selling the home, and the new owner wanted to have four trees removed that were close to the house and could pose a threat during a wind or ice storm. She anticipates the installation of the tight tank next week. She has had a professional tree remover, McFetridge, look at the trees, and he will leave the stumps, but take the logs off site. B. Ganem suggested the Commission may wish to require wood chips as this is a very steep slope. Upon a motion by C. Auman, seconded by P. Morrison, it was

VOTED: to issue a negative #3 Determination with the following conditions: no de-stumping shall occur, no debris shall enter the lake, and wood chips shall be placed around the stumps to assure there is no erosion into Lost Lake/Knops Pond.

The warrant for the 2011 Fall Town Meeting closes Thursday, August 25, 2011 so members should consider whether any articles should be proposed.

Members reviewed the proposals (Hancock Associates, Patrick Garner, Epsilon, and Comprehensive Environmental, Inc.) for a peer review of the Academy Hill culvert at the north entrance. C. Auman asked if we have to select the lowest bid, and B. Ganem said this is covered by the developer and the most responsive bid is recommended. M. Giguere commented he liked the submittal from Comprehensive Environmental Inc. which he thought was the most coherent

and better organized. B. Easom observed it is good to have an idea of what they have done before, particularly in the area of environmental issues and restorations. N. Madden noted CEI has the lowest bid and has also had experience in Burlington and in producing the MassDOT (Department of Transportation) highway construction design handbook. Upon a motion by M. Giguere made a motion, seconded by B. Easom, to select Comprehensive Environmental, Inc. M. Giguere added an amendment, seconded by C. Auman, and it was

VOTED: to add an additional three hours to allow the consultant to attend a meeting with the Conservation Commission.

It passed by majority vote, with B. Neacy abstaining.

Returning to the original, amended, motion, it was

VOTED: to select Comprehensive Environmental, Inc. to do the peer review for the wetland stream crossing at the north entrance of Academy Hill adding on the contingency of three additional hours in the event the consultant has to attend a Commission meeting.

The vote passed by majority, with B. Neacy abstaining.

7:30 p.m. – Appointment Cynthia Swezey

Ms. Swezey explained she had been kayaking in Lost Lake/Knops Pond and noticed a rope swing has been installed at the fishing point at Sargisson Beach. B. Ganem said she had received a report today of ‘vandalism’ at Sargisson Beach, and it appears the rope has now been cut. The Commission has never authorized a rope swing at the beach.

People are swimming at Sargisson Beach, and Ms. Swezey expressed concern about the state of the weeds around the swim area. The Beach is not staffed with lifeguards, and the docks are not in, but she felt the use of the weed harvester was immediately required for safety reasons. P. Morrison assured her the Commission would contact the group who is responsible for managing the weed harvester.

Ms. Swezey said she is working under the auspices of the New England Wildflower Society to inventory the *Sparganium natans* in Lost Lake/Knops Pond. As she progressed through the lake, she noticed the harvested weeds have been dumped near the shore line in Springy Pond. While some harvesting is necessary within the channel to Springy Pond, it is very important that harvested weeds be kept away from the shore. She had the understanding there is a fixed landing area where the weeds are trucked away from the lake. She said she would follow up on this at tomorrow night’s meeting with the Great Ponds Committee as there are endangered species present within the lake. Ms. Swezey questioned whether the group managing the weed harvesting maintains a log of areas where they operate the machine. Member Giguere pointed out they are operating under a Notice of Intent which does require the removal of the weeds more than 100 ft. from the lake. Members thanked her for coming in to report on her concerns.

B. Ganem reported a timely appeal has been registered with DEP regarding the Commission’s negative Determination for work proposed by Michael Mavilia across from 21 Redskin Trail.

Meanwhile, the neighbor (Richard Mavilia) complained Michael Mavilia was riding his bobcat up and down the driveway last night during the rainstorm. Members advised staying out of the dispute unless there is clearly an erosion problem or activities not authorized under the Determination are being conducted.

7:45 p.m. – Appointment Robert Collins

Attorney Collins explained the consultant for his client, Mr. Elio Sgrosso, was able to move the house out to the 100 – 200 ft. outer Riparian Zone. Commissioners visited the property this past Saturday. The lot is located at 2 Wyman Rd. and has an expired Order of Conditions. M. Giguere said he thought the location could be re-configured to be outside of the Riparian Zone altogether. C. Auman concurred, and Chairman Madden pointed out the site is within rare species habitat. Mr. Collins said he would work with his client on the plans.

Regarding the Partridgeberry parcel, Mr. Collins asserted he felt this important property should be in public hands. C. Auman mentioned it is already subject to a Conservation Restriction which provides a certain level of protection. P. Morrison asked how expensive the property is likely to be, and B. Neacy commented the Town does have a financial situation. C. Auman questioned whether it is appropriate to bring the possible purchase forward, but B. Easom felt the offer should be explored further. A LAND grant may be an appropriate source of funding.

B. Ganem will be on vacation from July 28th through August 7th, including the August 6, 2011 site visits.

The Division of Conservation Services has the original TABCOM (Groton Woods Camp) Conservation Restriction document which hopefully can be reviewed and recorded shortly.

B. Easom and D. Pitkin are working to record several other GPS points to finalize the Angus & Gibbet Hill Stewardship Plan. B. Easom plans to review a draft document to the surveyor R. Wilson to request a correction in the recorded Fuccillo plan. B. Easom and M. Giguere plan to finalize the Conservation Restriction Monitoring Report on the Allens Trail property.

8:00 p.m. – 134 Main St. Notice of Intent

Chairman Madden outlined the process that will be followed during the hearing. Consultant Bruce Ringwald said his client, Mt. Laurel Development, has filed an Abbreviated Notice of Resource Area Delineation and received an Order of Resource Area Delineation from the Conservation Commission. He indicated he will review what is proposed for the site, for the Buffer Zone, and touch upon the drainage plans. Through consultation with other boards and the public, he noted the number of structures has been reduced within the Buffer Zone to 1.5 housing units and 1 driveway while still enhancing the views and maintaining a quality neighborhood. Some drainage will go toward Main St., while the remainder goes to the wetlands at the back of the property. The existing conditions plan (Pg. C2-2) shows the approximate edge of priority habitat. Foundation drains are planned around each building. Level spreaders will be placed at both the northwest and southeast boundaries of the property. Clean groundwater would be discharging here. Mr. Ringwall estimated the increase in impervious surfacing will go from 13% to 34%.

Low impact development best management practices will be utilized, such as disconnecting roof runoff from roadway drainage. Three recharge galleries will capture any surcharge from all structural BMPs. Roadway drainage and drainage from three driveways will discharge into the center of the cul-de-sac where a constructed wetland is proposed. This would include a forebay and a high marsh and low marsh with an outlet control structure in the micropool. It is anticipated water will be retained there for 32 hours then draining to the 331 ft. elevation. Check dams are to be utilized to keep water in the high marsh area which will support specific types of vegetation. The constructed wetland will open into a view of Half Moon swamp and Gibbet Hill.

Two retaining walls, 3 to 4 ft. in height, will be separated by a bioretention swale draining to the rain garden. There will be minimal grading behind the wall. A stone dust walkway will lead to a small seating wall to allow for observation as it offers a vantage point in many directions. Sheet L1.3 outlines some of the exotic invasives currently within the 50-ft. Buffer Zone. Some species will be dug out while other are cut. The most prolific invasives are multiflora rose, honeysuckle, and bittersweet. These will be replaced with native shrubs, i.e., highbush blueberry and American cranberry, and the ground planted with a native seed mix to stabilize the site. All native plant materials will be used around the buildings and within the rain garden.

C. Auman acknowledged comments on the Massachusetts Endangered Species Act filing to the Natural Heritage & Endangered Species Program are not due until August 20, 2011. He pointed out the Commission's Wetland Bylaw Regulations state in Section 215-7. A "Adjacent upland resource areas are presumed significant to the protection of wetland resources and interests because activities undertaken in close proximity to resource areas have a high likelihood of adverse impact upon the wetland or other resources, either immediately, as a consequence of construction, or over time, as a consequence of daily operations or maintenance of such activities. Such adverse impacts from construction and use include, without limitation, erosion, siltation, loss of groundwater recharge, degradation of water quality and loss of wildlife habitat." The burden of proof rests with the applicant to avoid unacceptable adverse impacts including reducing the scale of the project. B. Ringwall responded they have reduced the amount of work by pulling buildings out of the buffer zone. They have scaled down the size and shifted locations.

Member Auman asked how large the area is where invasive control is proposed, and Mr. Ringwall replied ".4 acres or 17,000 SF". Mr. Auman questioned whether an escrow account was to be set up to make sure the maintenance happens as this is not an event, but a process. B. Ringwall explained there will be a condominium association responsible for managing the site. The Operation & Maintenance Plan outlines the best management practices throughout the site to help maintain water quality both during construction and in the future. The sites would be monitored during the growing season. Invasive control will be accomplished through hand-pulling or the use of Round-Up, but not in spray form which could kill adjacent plants.

C. Auman pointed out the site is surrounded by invasive species on adjoining properties. Is adding buildings and asphalt to the buffer zone and then mitigating with invasive control a large enough effort to make a significant difference in the advance of invasives? Mr. Ringwall showed an aerial photograph of Half Moon swamp, indicating invasives were rampant on the two properties south of this property, but other abutting properties were controlling invasives. He commented his client does not have control of those properties.

B. Ringwall explained the driveway will be 20 ft. wide near Main St. but will narrow to 18 ft. just after the parking area to the right. This meets the turning radius requirements for emergency vehicles and allows two-way traffic around the cul-de-sac roadway. A sidewalk with sloped granite curbing will encircle the cul-de-sac. Mr. Auman suggested driveways should be smaller and asked whether pervious pavement could be considered. Mr. Ringwall indicated this is more appropriate for flat sites as the storage spaces under the pervious surfacing is reduced by the sloping nature of this particular site.

B. Easom said he could appreciate the amount of work necessary to squeeze in the best locations for the buildings while trying to meet the interests of the Act, as well as financial objectives. He said he would rather see no encroachment into the natural wetland Buffer Zone. For mitigation for work in the Buffer Zone, he felt the invasive control should be supplemented by removing one structure from the Buffer Zone into the center of the cul-de-sac. Mr. Ringwall said this component is integral to the best management practices under low-impact development drainage. Detention basins require a lot of maintenance while this will create a sustainable management system. Check dams will retain pools of water, and the design was created using rainfall and temperature data. It will work as a viable wetland and is the first his firm has designed. The Planning Board consultants will review the design. He agreed nature does a better job, but the constructed wetland is meant to imitate nature and is needed to control stormwater.

Mr. Ringwall indicated his client is willing to deed a conservation restriction on approximately 1.3 or 1.4 acres, most of the 50 ft. Buffer Zone, to allow for continual upkeep of the invasive control area and a potential trail along Half Moon swamp that allows public access from abutting properties. With the conservation restriction, invasive control, and improvements in the diversity of habitats, as well as the enhancement of the quality of stormwater runoff, he suggested the overall site would have significant improvements.

D. Pitkin said he too would like to see the house out of the Buffer Zone. N. Madden requested details on the stormwater volume and sizing, the size of the constructed wetland, amount of impervious surfacing in the buffer zone, and design storms used to plan the stormwater treatment. Mr. Ringwall maintained all anticipated runoff from the 2-yr., 10-yr., and 100-yr. storms would be contained within the site. There would be a slight decrease in the amount of water that goes to the wetland, but the goal is to maintain the volume, clean it, and reduce the flow.

N. Madden asked how close the grading in the Buffer Zone is to the wetlands, and Mr. Ringwall replied "about 25 ft." Wattles will be used to control erosion and sedimentation. The bioretention swale between the retaining walls will allow significant settling. Ms. Madden asked if the survey had been ground-truthed, and Mr. Ringwall responded "It has been topographically surveyed in the field at 1-ft. contour elevations sufficient for control during construction." Continuing control of invasives will be a responsibility of the condominium association. B. Neacy asked what the low-impact development techniques will include, and Mr. Ringwall answered "street sweeping and catch basins with hoods are proposed". He added that techniques have been chosen which they feel are appropriate for the specific site. Mr. Neacy said he has a certain level of discomfort with anything within the 100-ft. Buffer Zone including the retaining walls.

P. Morrison said it is his preference to have the building removed from the Buffer Zone. He does, however, look forward to seeing the constructed wetland used as a model for other developments. The work at the back corners of the property is probably okay. The house within the Buffer Zone has a prime location with the best views. Member Morrison commended Mr. Ringwall on a thorough plan.

M. Giguere pointed out the work in the 100 ft. Buffer is not just houses but all the additional disturbances, including heavy grading and filling. When weighing whether it is better or worse to put buildings in the Buffer Zone, it is generally not better for the wetland area. B. Ringwall said plantings will include wildflower mixes, and he would like to see natural clustering of trees and shrubs rather than the proposed 20-ft. on center. Member Giguere commented the mitigation provided may have to be more creative or include something offsite, and the project will definitely require a peer review. The peer review would assist the Commission in making a decision on whether the proposed mitigation is adequate, appropriate, and effective. Members discussed what issues should be addressed.

Land Use Director Michelle Collette reminded those present this is a priority development under an expedited, coordinated permitting structure. Nitsch Engineering will be reviewing the planning and drainage components and Gary Hebert of Faye, Spofford & Thorndike will undertake an assessment of the traffic plans on behalf of the Planning Board. She noted no duplication of efforts should occur, but there are funds available to evaluate other components of the overall plan. C. Auman said "The question for the Conservation Commission is whether the plan leaves us in better shape than what is there now." P. Morrison added Nitsch would not be duplicating efforts as our evaluation will be environmental in nature. Mitigation is proposed to be the control of invasives and a conservation restriction. B. Ganem mentioned she talked with the Director of MassAudubon's Ecological Extension Service which does extensive invasive plant management throughout its sanctuaries in Massachusetts. This would be a third party review to assist in the determination of whether the invasive management plan is adequate and appropriate mitigation. The consultant may not necessarily make a judgment but may have other ideas on how to proceed.

C. Auman felt there should be a broader peer review to see whether the interests of the Act are being met with the Plan, taking into consideration the pre- and post-construction conditions, as well as ideas about how to get there.

B. Neacy thought perhaps we need both a biologist and a lawyer. He added a lawyer would have an understanding of the broader picture and interpretation of the Bylaw. Ms. Collette pointed out the consultant review funds cannot be used for legal purposes as it is anticipated the Town permitting boards would use Town Counsel. Resident Karen Corey (150 Main St.) said she has been listening to the presentation but wanted to know if the Commission will hold additional hearings at which she can speak. The Commission informed her that it is likely the hearing will be continued and that the public is always allowed to speak. Mr. Ringwall indicated the applicant wishes to continue but has concerns that it be a productive meeting, particularly if they need time in which to respond to a consultant's review.

Commissioners agreed to have B. Ganem select the consultant after soliciting three possible candidates with expertise within the areas discussed above. Upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by D. Pitkin, it was

VOTED: to continue the hearing for 134 Main St. to August 9, 2011.

B. Ganem explained this can be continued if the applicant feels they need additional time.

8:15 p.m. – Appointment Adam Burnett

Mr. Burnett stated his residence is 155 Gratuity Rd., and he abuts a corridor along the Nashua River. He maintains 600 ft. of clearing on his property. He has spent 18+ years with the U.S. Forest Service managing forests. He joined the Army Corps of Engineers in 2001 to work on habitat restoration projects. A. Burnett said he has a Master's degree in forestry management. He pointed out the Commission had not responded to his letter urging them to treat the Farmers & Mechanics property as emerging old growth. He said this is bottom land forest along a river terrace where there is shallow groundwater which could support the largest pines ever grown. Asserting the trees were as much as 150 years old, he advocated the forest be managed for emerging old growth characteristics leaving standing dead trees, leaving soils that may never have been plowed undisturbed, and not cutting 30 - 36 in. diameter pines approaching 130 ft. in height.

Mr. Burnett said that state mapping available from Harvard University shows this area as forested in 1830. There is currently no evidence of recent logging. He stated there is shallow groundwater, and the white pines can tolerate major flooding. White oaks have a deep taproot, and will not survive long under these conditions. A. Burnett maintained the whole stand and its ecosystem, including an active vernal pool complex and owls roosting in the white pine within 500 ft. of the river, will be disrupted. These components are all integral to the site which stays cool and moist. Large timber that has died, standing dead snags, are another indicator of an old growth system. Mature timber on site suppresses younger trees, and several have fallen. Mr. Burnett argued that it is already an uneven-aged stand, and cutting all large timber using a logging skidder with the resultant scarification will allow invasive seedlings to take hold. Invasive buckthorn survives in dense shade at this point, and it is possible to hand harvest this to prevent spreading. Some invasives depend on seed carrying birds and are not there now. There is no bittersweet on the site. The use of herbicides is not necessary unless logs are removed and that creates a disturbance. He maintained there are not a lot of opportunities for old growth to become established. This could be a site with cathedral pines that people love visiting.

Abutter Aaron Green (179 Gratuity Rd.) said he sees two issues with managing invasives and retaining trees to keep it healthy. If the principle managing objective is timber, he maintained there is not enough money in the parcel to generate funds to manage other properties. He pointed out there is a cadre of volunteers who have the ability to control, watch, and monitor for invasives.

Chairman Madden invited Commissioners to respond to these comments. B. Easom pointed out the Commission's guidelines for forestry projects also calls for old growth which can be carried out through leaving a parcel alone or with active forestry management to speed the process

along. UMass resources generally recommend this practice on larger stands. The process of natural selection will allow some to die, and it is happening now. Thinning out some of the bigger trees will release other stands.

N. Madden commended Mr. Burnett for coming in to share his expertise. She mentioned she looked at the brochure on “Restoring Old Growth Characteristics” and pointed out not all of the largest trees are to be taken out at Farmers & Mechanics. A. Green argued that it is a small buffer. Maintaining legacy trees could be a part of the cutting plan, and it may be 10 or more years before the next cut. A. Burnett emphasized the forest is already $\frac{3}{4}$ of the way to old growth, and the Commission should let it mature. Ms. Madden questioned whether some of our objectives and goals might not intersect, but clarified that the only way forward, in Mr. Burnett’s opinion, is to not cut. She also acknowledged the offer to provide invasive control. A. Burnett contended that work and proper management of the invasives would eliminate the need for continued applications of a herbicide. This would mimic the self-sustaining work that nature has done.

P. Morrison said it appears the different method of management called for is benign neglect which is the Commission’s current method. A. Burnett said the Commission could look at girdling trees to create standing dead trees. He pointed out it is critical to allow them to die in place. Removing invasives is not benign neglect. Mr. Morrison indicated he would like to talk with New England Forestry Foundation before making a decision. B. Neacy said he also wished to call on a representative from NEFF to consider a different point of view before going forward. NEFF has a history of maintaining old growth according to P. Morrison.

M. Giguere said he appreciated the opportunity to hear Mr. Burnett’s comments. He pointed out, however, that this is just one of the properties which the Commission has the responsibility of managing. The goal is to manage many properties, and it will not get done without adequate funding. He explained the Commission funded his participation in the Keystone program, and this encouraged him to consider active forestry management. The forestry cutting plan prepared for Farmers & Mechanics follows state guidelines outlined in Ch. 132. Member Giguere observed that the Commission’s planning for forestry management goes back at least four years. It is not benign neglect, but rather focused management. It has been marked for a timber harvest. Mr. Burnett protested he would have been involved from day 1 had the Commission had the courtesy to ask him. He cautioned there would be little revenue the first time around, and the Commission would be sacrificing old growth pine just to look at red oak, white oak, and hickory. A. Green said he sources exotic woods and walnut and did not see any value in a white pine stand. He felt the Commission was selectively mowing and milling.

M. Giguere said there may be opportunities for adjustment within the cutting plan. A. Burnett said he found it offensive that the Commission was referring to his proposal as benign neglect and indicated he is willing to do a lot more if the property is not cut. C. Auman replied that the Commission could use his skills to steward properties. He could provide an opinion on the management of invasives behind Williams Barn as an example. The consulting forester examined more than 36 sites in detail, and recommended cutting on Farmers & Mechanics, Baddacook Field, and Williams Barn Sorhaug Woods.

D. Pitkin interpreted Mr. Burnett's position as not taking any large trees and managing for old growth. N. Madden summarized the comments as a variety of different opinions. Selectman Anna Eliot commended the Commission for putting together a management plan. She noted spending millions to buy land requires the preparation of management plans for the future while minimizing current impacts. M. Giguere said this is the Commission's first attempt to actively manage forest land, and it appears that no matter what is done, someone is going to criticize. He felt it important that the Commission forge forward with its intentions for active management. Trees have been marked very selectively and conservatively compared to a cutting on adjacent property.

Eric Radlof of Bay State Forestry said public discussion is a key part of community forestry. This is a good opportunity to model good management practices. Bay State assessed every parcel with regard to wildlife habitat, its potential for early successional or old growth forestry techniques, and potential income. Farmers & Mechanics was identified as a very productive site. Bay State is very comfortable with the plan being reviewed by NEFF. Invasives can be ripped out, but it is very intense labor, and you can create a seed bed when you shake the brush during removal. A plaque could be placed on legacy trees to preserve them. A. Burnett underscored the need to preserve the whole stand.

C. Auman thanked the consulting foresters for being patient and sitting here so long. J. Hutchins said the trees are large because this is a very productive site. Farmers & Mechanics also has the advantage that forestry activities can be conducted here when it is rainy. The Commission has the choice to utilize this site for active timber management while leaving other conservation areas, capable of producing old growth, uncut because of access issues. Coarse woody material is important to forestry health, and Mr. Hutchins maintained Farmers & Mechanics is not as rare a site as Mr. Burnett believes it is. Sites with trees between 100 and 150 years old are very common throughout the state, and this is from the D'Amato paper. J. Hutchins pointed out forestry management in Maine is totally different as even-aged stands are managed for spruce-fir building materials. White pine and red oak grow well under the conditions available in this area, and we still have a flourishing mill system and are able to market and sell the wood. The plan for Farmers & Mechanics is to manage for uneven-aged species, the most sustainable type of forestry. There is the potential for bittersweet to spread in a white pine stand. The site has minimal pit and mound features, and it would be necessary to do a core sample to see if the till layer has been subject to plowing.

A. Burnett said he appreciated having an opportunity to provide input at this meeting and during the site walk. P. Morrison said he would talk with NEFF for educational purposes. B. Neacy indicated Dan and crew have looked at the sites in depth. Member Neacy said he comes at it from the point of view of a biologist, and he appreciates mixed diversity. There has been a significant investment of time and energy, and the Commission has an obligation to manage the forest for future generations. The state has 10 business days in which to review the forestry cutting plan, and the DCR state forester will visit the site and can provide additional input. A cutting of 30% of the trees is proposed. A. Burnett asserted that 99% of the big trees are to be cut, and there are many small birds living in tree cavities within marked trees. A. Green asked about the timing, and Commissioners said that will be decided at the time the bid goes out and is accepted. Logging contractors or direct mills may bid, and the Commission will select the final

bid. P. Morrison acknowledged the Commission has a financial interest in logging the property, but we are trying to make tax dollars go further. A. Burnett reiterated his belief this is a very important parcel, and thanked the Commission for listening. Commissioners agreed to continue discussion on forestry at Farmers & Mechanics to August 9, 2011.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara V. Ganem
 Conservation Administrator

Approved as drafted 8/23/11.

EXHIBITS

Document	Source	Date
Minutes	Conservation Commission	7/12/11
Order of Conditions	49 Old Ayer Rd./DEP#169-1060	Filed 6/23/11
Request for Determination of Applicability	Langley/25 Ridgewood Ave.	7/11/11
Proposal for peer review at Academy Hill	Hancock Associates \$3200	7/25/11
Proposal for peer review at Academy Hill	Epsilon Associates \$4235	7/25/11
Proposal for peer review at Academy Hill	Patrick Garner \$1350	7/22/11
Proposal for peer review at Academy Hill	Comprehensive Environmental, Inc. \$3150	7/25/11
Appeal of Request for Determination of Applicability	Mavilia/across from 21 Redskin Trail	Filed 6/21/11
DEP#169-690 (new plan Civil Solutions 7/12/11)	Sgrosso/2 Wyman Rd.	Filed 10/27/99
DEP#169-1062	Mt. Laurel Development/134 Main St.	Filed 7/18/11
Forestry Cutting Plan	Bay State Forestry/Farmers & Mechanics	7/18/11
Farmers & Mechanics Land Management File	Conservation Commission	Land acquired by eminent domain in 1967
Forest Stewardship Plan	Bay State Forestry/Farmers & Mechanics	5/11